

SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

13th Year of Publication

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Volume XIII, Number 11

P.O. Box 6226A, Washington, D.C. 20015

June 15, 1983

House Backs Bigger Budgets for R&D Agencies

Initial verdicts on the Administration's budget plans for fiscal 1984 are emerging from the House of Representatives, and, in general, they indicate that the Democratically controlled chamber exceeds the White House in willingness to raise spending on research and development.

In terms of established patterns, that's not unusual. But with science and high-tech widely hailed as economic saviors, the odds are substantially increased for safe passage of these increases through all the perils of the legislative course.

The theme of more for R&D has been strongly sounded by the House Appropriations Committee, which has voted out several bills that go beyond a presidential

Committee's generosity was the National Bureau of Standards, which has been targeted by the White House's marketplace ideologues for substantial reductions in fiscal 1984, which begins next October 1. Instead, the Appropriations Committee reported out a bill May 25 that would raise the Administration's request by \$26 million, for a total budget of \$125 million—which is \$7 million above the current NBS budget. The Committee specifically rejected the Administration's plans to eliminate or sharply reduce the NBS Center for Fire Research, Center for Building Technology, and Institute for Computer Science and Technology. In its report, it stated, "The committee feels that these and other important programs...are performed in the na-

(Continued on Page 3)

The NIH Grant System:

Q and A With the Chief—Page 4

budget that, in total, was already quite favorable to science and technology. In the first test of the full House's response to the boost, which came on June 2 with a vote of 216-143, the Environmental Protection Agency was a big winner, with a net gain of \$23 million more for R&D than the Committee's figure, which was \$30 million above the Administration's request. Overall, EPA came out of the House with a 1984 budget of \$1.3 billion, which is where the agency's budget stood in 1981. The Administration sought \$948 million for 1984.

The Appropriations report tartly rejected the Administration's budget-cutting rationales for EPA, stating that it found them "sorely lacking." And it went on to observe of EPA that "research and development activities cannot be further contracted and subjugated to regulatory program requirements in the face of environmental problems that are found to be more complex, more serious and more widespread each day. Finally," the committee stated, "it is clear that for EPA to operate effectively and maintain its credibility, the Agency's critical mass of technical and professional expertise cannot be allowed to erode through further personnel reductions."

In floor debate on the EPA bill, it was pointed out by Rep. Timothy E. Wirth (D-Col.) that EPA's staff had declined by nearly 3000 since the Reagan Administration took office, and that the agency was scheduled to drop another 300 employees by September 30.

Among the other beneficiaries of the Appropriations

In Brief

Talk of a federal Department of Science has been revived by the President's plan to reorganize the Commerce Department into a Department of International Trade and Industry, and join the National Bureau of Standards—now in Commerce—to the free-standing National Science Foundation. NSF's friends don't care for the scheme, fearing it might divert the Foundation from its holy mission of basic research. But the idea of an agglomeration of science agencies has some influential supporters, among them Senator John Glenn (D-Ohio), who's accelerating in the race for the Democratic presidential nomination.

Taking a cue from the agreement at last year's Versailles summit to pursue international scientific and technological cooperation, the Department of Energy has invited the other six nations to consider collaborating on the next generation of particle accelerators. The prospect of sharing has always aroused anxieties among the American barons of physics, but with construction and operating costs for the next grand machine estimated in the billions, DoE finds its clients a bit more receptive than usual.

Philip Abelson, editor of *Science* since 1962, has announced plans to relinquish the post, but says he won't go until January 1985. Some of the powers that be at the parent American Association for the Advancement of Science have been grouching about the growing preeminence of the British journal *Nature*—which frequently is first with major scientific papers. Abelson, 70, has stubbornly insisted that he's in no hurry to go.

Berkeley Materials Lab Derailed in House

With one muddle-minded paragraph, the House Appropriations Committee has blocked, but not killed, the Administration's plans for a big materials lab at the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory—on grounds that it was proposed late and lacked peer review; and then the Committee went on to approve labs at Columbia University and Catholic University that were proposed even later, also without peer review.

The episode, which was received with incomprehension and scatological exclamations at the White House Science Office and the Department of Energy, contains more whim than politics, and mainly reflects the Congress's prerogative for doing whatsoever it pleases, without reference to consistency.

The budget item that drew the Committee's ire is the proposed National Center for Advanced Materials Research (NCAM), a pet interest of George A. Keyworth II, the White House Science Adviser, who proudly unveiled the project when he briefed the press in January on the 1984 budget. Keyworth described the Center as both a new model for academic-industrial cooperation and as a means for rejuvenating an aging national laboratory.

The proposal, previously unheard of outside select circles, quickly stirred anxieties in existing materials-research centers, which feared a diversion of their funds, and an effective lobbying campaign was mobilized.

The Appropriations Committee report, issued May 24, commences its discussion of new labs by recommending, without comment, \$5 million apiece for downpayments on two labs that first came to Washington's attention many months after NCAM was publicly proposed—Columbia's National Center for Chemical Research and Catholic's Vitreous State Laboratory. (The aromatic politics of their initial legislative good fortune was described in the preceding issue of SGR.)

The report then proceeds to NCAM, stating that the request for \$25.9 million in startup money is "deferred without prejudice." The offered explanation is that "The Committee is concerned with the manner in which

this project, which is estimated to cost a total of \$174 million before it is finished, was inserted into the budget process by the Administration after the Department of Energy had transmitted its budget requirements to the Office of Management and Budget.

"This is highly unusual," says the Committee, "and results in extreme fluctuations in a constrained basic energy sciences budget that may result in undesirable impacts throughout the program. The Committee is also concerned that the customary and desirable peer review of this project was not undertaken, largely due to the last-minute inclusion of the proposal in the budget. Peer review in the scientific community is a recognized and necessary element to insure that all possible aspects of proposed research be observed. The absence of peer review may have inhibited the site selection and may have resulted in a less-than-optimum concept for an overall materials science center."

In a reference to plans for a synchrotron light source as the centerpiece at NCAM, the Committee added that "It may be, for example, that additional materials analysis technologies such as neutron scattering or sub-micron facilities or other examinations methodologies might have been included in the proposal had the normal reviews been conducted. It may be, in fact, that a more extensive review of the institutional capabilities that exist at other national laboratories and throughout the university community could yield benefits to the final materials center concept."

The Committee said it awaited the results of a kind of catchup peer review that DoE organized to quell opposition to NCAM.

Those who hatched the NCAM scheme take heart from the money cut being "without prejudice." Also, since NCAM's construction is scheduled to take six years, the delay could be absorbed by a bit of speedup.

Asked to explain the Committee's reverence for peer review at Berkeley and indifference to peer review at Catholic and Columbia, a staff member of the Appropriations Committee told SGR, "The actions on the two were done differently."

©Science & Government Report, Inc., 1983

ISSN 0048-9581

Editor and Publisher
Daniel S. Greenberg

Associate Publisher
Wanda J. Reif

Circulation Manager
Margaret E. Lee

Contributing Correspondents

Christopher Joyce, Kim A. McDonald (Washington); Francois Segquier (Paris); Ros Herman (London)

Independently published by *Science & Government Report, Inc.*, twice monthly, except in January, July & August. Annual subscription: Institutions, \$132.50 (two years, \$235.00). Information about bulk and individual rates upon request. Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St. N.W., Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. Second-class postage at Washington, DC. Please address all subscription correspondence to Box 6226A, Northwest Station, Washington, DC 20015. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on Xerox University Microfilms. Claims for missing back issues will be filled without charge if made within six months of publication date.

Administration Initiates Search for Teacher "Heroes"

President Reagan's cut-rate plan for boosting science and math education by recognizing teacher "heroes" is wobbling down the bureaucratic trail, enroute to a ceremony planned for early fall.

Announced in February by Presidential Science Adviser George A. Keyworth II, the plan calls for identifying one science and one math recipient in each state, plus Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia, and bringing the 104 of them to Washington to meet the President. Each will receive a certificate and a check for \$5000—for use by their schools.

A number of matters remain unsettled at this point, among them the name of the award. The original title was the President Award for Excellence in Science and Mathematics Teaching, but that was before the National Science Foundation was assigned the task of picking the winner.

NSF promptly contracted the chore to the National

Science Teachers Association, and then advised the Association that it had decided upon a new name: Presidential Award for Science and Mathematics Teachers and National Science Foundation Award. The Association replied that that was sort of cumbersome, and at last report the matter was under discussion.

Meanwhile, the Association finds itself facing a short deadline for making the selections, since NSF wants to get the checks written and off its premises before the end of the fiscal year, September 30. Otherwise, the money reverts to the US Treasury.

The Association has responded to the demand for haste by adopting Matthew's rule that "Unto everyone that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance." The winners will be selected from among previous winners of prizes for excellence in science and mathematics teaching.

...Sea Grant Program Survives Wipeout Effort

(Continued from Page 1)

tional interest and should not be sacrificed in an effort to reduce budget expenditures."

Another object of Reaganite distaste, the Sea Grant Program, administered by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, is slated for oblivion in the President's budget. But the Appropriations Committee recommended maintenance of its current annual budget, \$35 million. That's quite good in comparison to the big zero that the White House has in mind for the program, but the current Congressional favor for R&D-related matters must be viewed against the carnage that the Reagan Administration was able to get away with in its first 18 months in office. Peak funding for the Sea Grant Program occurred in 1981, when the budget was nearly \$42 million.

NASA came out of the Appropriations Committee with \$95 million added to the Administration's request, which would bring its 1984 budget to \$5.8 billion. But, as usual in recent years, the financially voracious Space Shuttle accounts for a major part of the increase—in this case, \$50 million for orbiter and engine spares to be held in reserve. Another \$45 million above the Administration's request was recommended for the Space Telescope, which the Committee matter-of-factly noted is taking longer and costing nearly double the original \$600 million that was estimated. Noting "severe management problems at both the agency and various contractors," the Committee indicated it plans to keep a close watch on the project—though at its advanced

stage of overruns, the telescope is past the point of no return.

Another big increase, \$20 million, was recommended for NASA "for research and analysis in physics and astronomy and planetary programs to be distributed at the agency's discretion."

The National Science Foundation, slated by the Administration for a \$200-million increase next year, was recommended for \$23 million atop that, for a total of \$1.3 billion. The Committee suggested a few rearrangements within the budget of the increasingly popular Foundation, such as a boost of \$15 million for "high-technology instrumentation," a cut of \$10 million in NSF's fast-growing support for the hard sciences, and a cut of \$15 million in the ocean-drilling program. This last item is intended to indicate the Committee's displeasure over the Administration's unwillingness to provide NSF with a successor to the veteran drilling ship *Glomar Challenger*. Stating that it understood that the Administration would abide by an advisory committee recommendation for leasing an existing drilling ship, the Committee said 1984 drilling funds are to be limited to that arrangement, and "No funds are included for the *Glomar Challenger* and the Foundation is expected to terminate work undertaken by that vessel."

On the up side, the Committee recommended a \$5-million increase for NSF's Directorate for the Biological, Behavioral and Social Sciences. "These

(Continued on Page 4)

A Talk with the Head of NIH's Grant System

As Director of the Division of Research Grants at the National Institutes of Health, Carl D. Douglass presides over NIH's peer-review process, the most influential checkpoint in the labyrinth through which all applications for investigator-initiated support must pass. A biochemist who has been with the Division since 1971, and its Director since 1976, Douglass conversed June 1 with SGR about the increasing competition for NIH resources and the problems and changes facing the network of study sections responsible for peer review. Following are excerpts, edited for brevity and clarity:

SGR. *What's happening with the scores for applications?*

Douglass. Study selections are made up of scientists who are well aware of the scarcity of money and our inability to fund a lot of the applications. Consequently, we are seeing changes in the study sections' behavior, with respect to both the number of applications that they recommend for approval—it's going up; we're getting fewer and fewer recommendations for disapproval—and at the same time we're getting changes in the priority scores. The number of approvals is going up as a proportion of the total.

SGR. *What's causing that?*

Douglass. Are things better? Who knows what the answer is? It may be such a phenomenon as we've seen in educational institutions—grade inflation; everybody passes.

SGR. *What's your speculation?*

APPROPRIATIONS

(Continued from Page 3)

funds may be distributed at the Foundation's discretion," it stated, "but the Committee urges that special emphasis be placed on the social and economic sciences which have absorbed the largest reductions over the past three years."

The biggest boost for NSF was for science education, which the Committee would fund at \$70 million, which is \$31 million above the Administration's figure, and \$40 million higher than NSF's current education budget. The Committee realistically noted that Congress is awash with far bigger proposals for spending in this area, and it described its recommendation as a "downpayment" pending developing of a broader federal program for aiding science education.

During the floor debate on the bill that included the NSF appropriation, several members argued for raising the Foundation's budget even higher than the increase recommended by the Appropriations Committee, but the House apparently had done enough budget busting for the day and declined to go further.—DSG

Douglass. I suspect, in certain disciplines, in certain areas, there's some gamesmanship going on, trying to give people in the area an advantageous position with respect to everybody else. I don't think it's happening across the board.

SGR. *The study sections and the applicants constitute a kind of community, don't they?*

Douglass. We used to try to control this kind of thing by normalization of the scores. But there were so many defects in the normalization that we abandoned it. There was a lot of resentment on the part of certain study sections that felt we were manipulating their work. Then there were the statistically sophisticated study sections that figured out ways to beat the game. So, we finally gave up and went back to unmodified scores.

Difficult Discriminations

SGR. *With the number of applications growing, and the scores getting better, you have to have a very good score to get funding.*

Douglass. That's the case. And as the institutes make their funding decisions, they're funding higher and higher in terms of the quality of applications. It means also that the power to discriminate by using those scores is being changed. It's hard to say there's a whole lot of difference between a score of 180 and 175. One vote on a study section could make that kind of a difference. As we clump these scores at the upper end, and crowd them together in, let's say, what are perceived by study section members to be the fundable ranges, we're crowding a spectra of quality together, whereas they might have been separated out in former days.

SGR. *Is there any administrative device for coping with that?*

Douglass. There's no device in place. Of course, we're worrying about it. We're going to be soon examining the process, the use, the interpretation and all aspects of priority scores. We're going to involve the community in this examination. We're not yet sure how we're going to do it.

SGR. *NIH has been trimming awards to make available funds go further. How is that done?*

Douglass. The applicant presents a budget to the study section for the first stage of peer review. The study sections take a pretty hard look at these budgets, and they recommend to us, for a new application, about 15 percent less than the applicant asked for. In the past few years, it's been necessary for us to do further surgery at the time of award. And the institute staffs have been charged with the responsibility of taking away some more.

(Continued on Page 5)

...Support Growing for New Funding System

(Continued from Page 4)

SGR. Is this done selectively, or is it done across the board?

Douglass. It's not done in the meat axe fashion, so that everyone loses 12 or 15 percent, or whatever. Institute staffs will generally set a goal for themselves, it's up to them how they reach it—by selective negotiations, taking larger amounts away from those projects where there appears to be a possibility for doing so without substantial harm; less from others.

SGR. Is there an alternative to this trimming process?

Douglass. Many people are beginning to feel that it's getting to be counterproductive. You can trim a project back to where you don't get any work done. There's a movement afoot, promoted under the term "sliding scale," where a number of scientists have proposed we fund many more applications—say, to a priority score of 250 [in NIH's topsy-turvy scoring system, lower is better]—but we do so in a way that the top group gets full funding. But then we grade off down to 40 percent, or something, as we approach the 250 mark, cutting back in steps. Many of us feel that's not a wise thing to do. It could result in a number of very unfortunate circumstances. The attractive feature of this for the scientist is that he did get some funding. He remains alive.

SGR. Is there serious pressure for the new system?

Douglass. Yes.

Study Section Workloads

SGR. What sort of load is handled by the average study section member?

Douglass. An optimal load for a study section is about 210 applications per year. About 70 for each of their three meetings per year. With 15 members, each individual would be given for review in a three-day meeting about five applications on which he or she would be the primary reviewer; in addition, five more applications to serve as secondary reviewer, and if we have a third reviewer, some more. In addition, we ask each member to be responsible for all the applications, if not in depth, then at least in a way that allows them an responsible evaluation. Now, we've been running upwards of more than 100 applications per round, rather than 70. So, there's extra work occasioned by that, let's say a third more.

SGR. What about the recent proposal by the General Services Administration to eliminate the \$100-a-day consulting fee for study section members while they're at meetings?

Douglass. We've taken a position against it.

SGR. From the time an application is received, how long does it take to reach a decision?

Douglass. It's a long time, unfortunately. It's a

ponderous system, necessarily, I guess. If an application is received by July 1, we would send it to the meeting of the study sections that occur in October and November. It would go to the National Advisory Council for the legally required evaluation in January and February, and we would notify the individual soon after that. The earliest possible date that the applicant could plan to begin work would be April 1. So, we're talking about 9 months.

New Appeals System

SGR. Is there any effort to speed it up?

Douglass. Yes, but as long as we conduct the system in the matter that we do, involving panel meetings and study sections—and we're required to do that by law—and the dual level of the national advisory councils, it's almost inconceivable to me how we could compress it.

SGR. How many people out there will come back and say, "This study section doesn't know what it's talking about"?

Douglass. An increasing number, as you can see from the number of unfunded applicants. If I had to guess an absolute number, I'd say we get half-a-dozen such letters a month. It's not a big problem, and when it happens we respond by saying, "If you don't believe that study section knows what it's talking about, give us another application and we'll send it to another study section." Generally, we will not do that the first time around, because we want that original study section to see how that investigator has responded. Because, maybe indeed they do want to change their minds. But if we go twice through a study section with an application, and the individual comes back a third time, we're going to find another place to send it. And it may be that we'll tailor-make a special study section for them.

SGR. I understand that a formal appeals procedure is in the works.

Douglass. It would be an appeal operative on these decisions we make here of a non-scientific nature. The investigator might not like the decision we make about a study section or a council to refer the application to; he might object to some position we took in respect to awarding an amount. This kind of thing. I don't think we'll ever open a system of appeals that circumvents the best scientific judgment we can get from the outside.

SGR. What's been happening to the average size grant over the years?

Douglass. It appears to have increased. If we look at an average grant, using 1972 for a base year, the dollars have increased from \$46,400 to \$100,400. But in constant dollars, there's been practically no change at all:

(Continued on Page 6)

...More Grant Money Going for Tenured Salaries

(Continued from Page 5)

The increase is from \$46,400 to \$46,700.

SGR. Do those figures include indirect costs?

Douglass. Yes, these are total.

SGR. Indirect costs have gone up a great deal in that period, haven't they?

Douglass. Yes, the amount of dollars available to the investigator as direct costs, to conduct research, has actually decreased, when you take away indirect costs and correct for inflation.

SGR. Items charged to indirect costs vary from university to university. Salaries, for example, are charged to NIH by some, and not by others.

University Has Option

Douglass. There has been over the years continuing sentiment in the scientific community to limit, or really eliminate, the payment of salaries [with NIH research funds] for tenured faculty on research grants. This would stretch the money further. There are other factors which tend in that direction. There's a question of institutional loyalty. An investigator, as a faculty member, owes a loyalty to his own institution, but when he knows that the dollars for that salary are coming from NIH, I'm sure that loyalty is diminished. It's not a healthy thing. But, then, on the other hand, the position of the government has always been, at OMB and others, that we should pay the full costs of research, and not ask others to bear the responsibility for what are essentially federal research programs. There is a requirement for cost sharing [by research institutions] and it's generally done at a level of 5 percent or thereabouts. It can be done either in the direct-cost area or in indirect costs.

SGR. Isn't there an inequity if a tenured professor at one institution is paid out of grant funds while a professor at another is paid out of the university's own funds?

Douglass. From a strictly bureaucratic point of view, it's of no concern to us—theoretically; put that in quotation marks. The option is open for the university to ask for salary for the tenured investigator. If they choose not to do so, we'll accept the contribution.

SGR. In some instances, they choose not to do so because they're not fully informed about the availability of grant funds for salaries. Isn't that so?

Douglass. We've had the policy of full cost recovery in place since the mid-1960s. We've publicized it.

SGR. Is it mainly because of loyalty considerations that institutions choose to pay their own faculties?

Douglass. Presumably.

SGR. But as times get more difficult for more institutions aren't they likely...?

Douglass. They are doing it. It's a complex dynamic. Over the years, about two-thirds of the money we've awarded has gone for salaries and associated personnel costs. That has been creeping up very slightly over the years; it's now about 70 percent. And I'm sure we're seeing institutions shifting people who were previously carried on state or private money.

SGR. Do you see old clients who previously provided salaries now turning the burden over to NIH?

Douglass. I have a feeling that's happening, but we don't have any specific information. We have a big problem in grasping reality here because in 1975 the OMB decided we didn't need a detailed expenditure report [from grantees]. We don't know how they're spending the money until the auditors go out there. Programatically, we have no idea—we may budget 70 percent of the grant for personnel costs, but we don't really know what the institution does. Generally, when we did get reports of expenditures, there was a little bit of a shift, but not much. But Dr. Wyngaarden [Director of NIH] is interested in critically examining our relationship to the tenured investigator and what our obligations are vis-a-vis the obligations of the institution.

SGR. How are you dealing with the problems of young investigators getting started on research careers?

Douglass. The latest figures show we are continuing to bring them in at the previous rates. For a decade, it's been that about 12 percent of the new awards each year are for young investigators.

SGR. What are the odds for getting a renewal after a first grant?

Douglass. The chances are better for getting an application funded if it's a continuation, as compared with a new application. You've got the period of experience behind you, accomplishments and progress to show.

Costs of Peer-Review System

SGR. What's happening to the duration of awards?

Douglass. The proportion of five-year awards in the total has slightly increased over a few years. This may or may not be due to changes in the study section recommendations about larger numbers getting five years. It may be due to the fact that we're supporting better and better applications as money gets shorter and shorter. We're moving up the priority-score scale. The ones on the top will be relatively enriched with longer recommended awards. So, that may be the reason that the project period appears to be lengthening. But far and away, three years remains the most common award.

SGR. How much does NIH spend on the peer-review system?

Douglass. Our budget in the Division is about \$16.5
(Continued on Page 7)

In Print: Navy's Window on Research Abroad

The Office of Naval Research is the source of two unusual publications that would surely develop a wider following in the scientific community if the Navy weren't so modest about them. Subscriptions are available upon request and without charge.

The publications, both unclassified, are the monthly *European Scientific Notes*, produced by ONR's London office, and *Scientific Bulletin*, an every-other-month publication of ONR's Tokyo office. Written by ONR staff members, civilian and military, the two provide rare windows on scientific and technological activities abroad. Coverage ranges across all major fields of science and technology, and is generally based on a visit to a research center or attendance at a conference. A recent issue of the *European Scientific Notes* included articles on "Metallurgy and Materials at Oxford," "Statistics at the Technical University of Denmark," the French "XII National Colloquium on Specialized Polymers," and British "Research in Navigation Techniques."

How to get them: The Navy isn't keen to broaden the circulation, but we're told it will respond to requests for subscriptions, which should be addressed as follows: *European Scientific Notes*, ONR Branch Office, Box 39, FPO New York 09510; *Scientific Bulletin*, ONR Liaison Office Far East, APO San Francisco 96503.

The Congressional Office of Technology Assessment has issued two background papers prepared in conjunction with a forthcoming major report on tropical forest resources. Under the overall heading of "Sustaining Tropical Forest Resources," they are Background Paper #1, *Reforestation of Degraded Lands* (Stock No. 052-003-00909—900); and Background Paper #2, *US and International Institutions* (Stock No. 052-003-00910-2); available for \$4.50 each from Superintendent of Documents, USGPO, Washington, DC 20402.

NIH

(Continued from Page 6)

million. We've got over 400 people, and most of it is salaries. About 90 percent is devoted to peer review; we do have some other functions. That turns out to about \$14.9 million for peer review. Then if we add in what we pay the study section members for per diem and travel, that's another \$5.5 million. So, it all totals up to about \$20 million. Which, if you divide by the number of grant applications that we review, turns out to be about \$1125 per application, or about \$2.48 per \$1000 requested, or about \$11.37 per \$1000 awarded. A modest sum. I'd like to see any business operate with that kind of overhead.

World Military Expenditures and Arms Transfers, 1971-1980, annual report by US Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, lists country-by-country military spending, plus military aid given and received, for a worldwide grand total of \$595 billion in 1980. (ACDA Publication 115, 129 pages, free, from Defense Program and Analysis Division, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, Washington, DC 20451; tel. 202/632-0816.)

First Annual Report of the Director, National Institute of Arthritis, Diabetes, and Digestive and Kidney Diseases, a very slick, magazine-style production, aimed at lay readers, published in response to a Congressional directive for an annual report by the NIH institute that presides over the ailments that are catching up with cancer and heart disease as objects of congressional interest. (NIH Publication No. 82-2375, 111 pages, free, from National Institute of Arthritis, Diabetes, and Digestive Diseases, Building 31, Room 9A-03, Bethesda, Md. 20205.)

Assessing the Impacts of Technology on Society, an opaque product of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, muses in its conclusion on whether "impact assessment" is "to be just a report-producing exercise through which assessors are 'building a library for non-readers?'" Obviously, yes, if they keep on like this. (80 poorly printed pages from typewritten, single-spaced text, \$9 per copy, available from OECD sales agents, worldwide; in US, OECD Publications and Information Center, 1750 Pennsylvania Ave. Nw., Suite 1207, Washington, DC; tel. 202/724-1857. Also available, without charge, *OECD Catalog of Publications*.)

Subscription Form

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station
Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

☐ Renew my subscription; ☐ Check enclosed

☐ Enter my subscription; ☐ Please bill

Institutional subscribers: one year, \$132.50 ☐; two years, \$235.00 ☐

(Overseas airmail, \$25.00 per year additional.)

Name

Address

Zip

Environmental Council Assailed in House

Remember the Council on Environmental Quality?

Founded in 1969 to serve as the President's principal staff support on national environmental matters, it performed with distinction prior to the arrival of the Reagan Administration. Its chairmen included such dyed-in-the-wool environmentalists as Russell Peterson, Russell Train, and Gus Speth. Since then, however, it has plummeted to near-oblivion, as is noted in a harsh commentary issued May 24 by the House Appropriations Committee.

Slicing \$213,000 from the Administration's \$926,000 request for the Council—under Carter the CEQ budget was \$3.4 million—the Appropriations Committee observed that “the composition and role of the Council have been radically changed in the past two years. Budget reductions have decreased staff from 49 in the 1981 budget to 13 in the 1984 request. The Council's changing role is further evidenced by the fact that not a single scientist or technical expert is on the permanent staff. This renders the Council unqualified to offer substantive contributions or policy advice.

“The accomplishments of the Council in 1981 and 1982 have been modest at best. There have been no Presidential briefings, no environmental messages, no arbitration of interagency disputes, and no substantive changes to the NEPA (National Environmental Policy Act) process. The Council's major function seems to be acting as a spokesperson for the Administration's environmental agenda. Internal management controls appear to be weak, as eviden-

ced by poor budget justifications, a doubling of travel costs in two years, circulation of reports to Congress to private groups for comment prior to submission, and up to six-month delays in transmission of annual reports.”

Stating that “The Committee has serious reservations concerning CEQ's performance of its statutory mission, the significance of its contributions to the nation's environmental quality, and the cost-effectiveness of funds appropriated to the Council,” the Appropriations Committee reduced the already skimpy presidential budget request by \$213,000. The funds, it said, “are better utilized in EPA research and enforcement activities.”

The current Chairman of CEQ is A. Alan Hill, a Californian who was in the “building specialties business” at the time of his appointment.

SGR Binders for Sale

Embossed looseleaf binders that can hold two years' issues of *Science & Government Report* are available for \$6.95 each.

Also, a new printing is available of the collected *Grant Swinger Papers*, by D.S. Greenberg. Included are “Let's Hold a Conference,” “Swinger on Reagan,” and “Academic Finance: Overhead and Underhand.” (32 pages, \$4.95.)

Order from: *Science & Government Report*, PO Box 6226A, Washington, DC 20015. Please include payment with order.

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station
Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

Second class postage paid
at Washington, D.C.

SGR Summer Schedule

The next issue of *Science & Government Report* will be published July 15, 1983.

Xerox-University Microfilms
300 N. Zeeb Rd
Ann Arbor

9999

MI 48106

